CANUCK LAW
Reporting That You're Not Getting Elsewhere (Do Your Own Research To Verify)

SEPTEMBER 26, 2024 BY RONNIE

Adam Skelly, Part 4: October Hearing To Be Postponed Into 2025


Ontario
Français
Menu
SKELLY WILLIAM CV22006835920000 Toronto SKELLY et al v. HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF ONTARIO et al N
Rep Name: IAN J. PERRY
Amount: $0.00
Case Opened Date: 2022-06-30
Most Recent Order Type: N/A
Most Recent Order Date: N/A
Next Event: Motion on notice
Next Event Date: 2024-10-01

The long anticipated hearing of Adam Skelly challenging the Reopening Ontario Act (R.O.A.) has been delayed again, this time, until 2025. It was supposed to begin next week, and last for 3 days. See parts 1, 2 and 3 for background information.

The prime reason seems to be that one of the expert witnesses has withdrawn, leaving Skelly scrambling to find a replacement.

Justice Akazaki vacated the dates, while questioning whether or not the hearings could be squeezed into a single day, or 2.

ENDORSEMENT

[1] This is a request to adjourn and reschedule a three-day hearing of a constitutional challenge to a provincial offence arising from the alleged breach of the Ontario Covid-19 lockdown order.

[2] The OCJ has stayed the provincial offence trial. The applicant / accused has waived his s. 11(b) rights. Nevertheless, I am cognizant of the need to avoid further delay. The OCJ proceeding largely entails an agreed statement of fact.

[3] The adjournment was necessitated by the withdrawal of one of the applicant's expert witnesses. There are also additional steps to be undertaken.

[4] The main impediment to scheduling the return date was the dispute over the length of the hearing. The applicant maintained the case requires three days. The respondents both stated the hearing can be completed in one day.

[5] There is an advantage to having the duration of the hearing settled by a case conference judge, once counsel have organized the completion of the next steps. If the hearing can take place during one day or two instead of three, the hearing can be scheduled earlier and without taking up unnecessary hearing dates.

[6] Therefore, I hereby order:
1. The October 1, 2, and 7, 2024, hearing dates are hereby vacated.
2. The parties shall request a case conference at the earliest opportunity, once the next steps have been agreed, to reschedule the hearing

Why does all of this still matter? For starters, the R.O.A. is still on the books, even if there are no orders in effect from it. This means that in theory, a new "crisis" could lead to future dictates.

COURT DECISIONS:
(1) Skelly – Restraining Order Deferred Matter
(2) Skelly – Restraining Order Decision, December 2020
(3) Skelly – Criminal Court Limits What He Can Post Online
(4) Skelly – Judge Lacks Jurisdiction To Hear Case, June 2021
(5) Skelly – Costs Of $15,000 Ordered For Failed Motion
(6) Skelly – Costs From 2020 Kimmel Decision, Previously Deferred
(7) Skelly – Motion For Security For Costs Decision, September 2023

2020/2021 COURT DOCUMENTS:

(1) Skelly – Application Record Restraining Order (Michael Swinwood)

(2) Skelly – Notice of Constitutional Question (February)

(3) Skelly – Amended Notice Of Constitutional Question (June)

(4) Skelly – Book of Transcripts – Respondents (Applicants)

(5) Skelly – Book of Transcripts – Respondent on Motion – HMTQ

(6) Skelly – 2021 Motion Factum

(7) Skelly – 2021 Motion Amended Factum – Respondents (Applicants)

(8) Skelly – 2021 Motion Responding Factum

(9) Skelly – 2021 Motion Reply Factum

(1) Skelly – RBC Default Judgement Order

MALPRACTICE SUIT AGAINST MICHAEL SWINWOOD:

(1) Skelly – Swinwood Malpractice Statement Of Claim

NEW APPLICATION DOCUMENTS:

(1) Skelly – Notice Of Application (Ian Perry)

(2) Skelly – Costs – Notice of Motion – Moving Party (Respondent) HMTK

(3) Skelly – Costs – Motion Record-Moving Party (Respondent)

(4) Skelly – Costs – Applicant Responding Motion Record Security For Costs

(5) Skelly – Costs – Factum – Moving Party – HMK

(6) Skelly – Costs – Responding Factum Applicants Skelly et al

(7) Skelly – Justice Akazaki Deferral Of Case

EXPERT REPORTS:

(1A) Skelly – Byram Bridle Resume

(1B) Skelly – Byram Bridle Expert Report

(1C) Skelly – Byram Bridle Expert Reply Report

(2A) Skelly – Douglas Allen Resume

(2B) Skelly – Douglas Allen Expert Report

(2C) Skelly – Douglas Allen Expert Report

(3A) Skelly – Gilbert Berdine Resume

(3B) Skelly – Gilbert Berdine Expert Report

(3C) Skelly – Gilbert Berdine Expert Reply Report

(4A) Skelly – Harvey Risch Affidavit
(4B) Skelly – Harvey Risch Expert Report

(5A) Skelly – Joel Kettner Resume
(5B) Skelly – Joel Kettner Expert Report
(5C) Skelly – Joel Kettner Expert Reply Report

(6A) Skelly – William Briggs Resume
(6B) Skelly – William Briggs Expert Report
(6C) Skelly – William Briggs Expert Reply Report

ADAM SKELLY, CANADA, GLOBALISM, UN/WHO, VACCINES

One Reply to “Adam Skelly, Part 4: October Hearing To Be Postponed Into 2025”

Ehren Rebmann

OCTOBER 3, 2024 AT 10:33 AM

It is HIGH TIME for Adam’s court persecution to be over! Take that A**hole F*rd to court and charge him with many breaches of the law and the constitution. Then let that drag through the courts for six years, all the time trying to ruin what little he has left of his reputation. I have had enough of government sanctioned LAWFARE! Clean out the justice system and the Lieberal govt. and the totalitarians who forced the entire Covid plandemic on us! We need freedom again! F Trudeau (Turdo)